



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,276	04/14/2004	Philip A. Shafer	1014-081US01/JNP-0336	6205
72689	7590	05/15/2008	EXAMINER	
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A. 1625 RADIO DRIVE, SUITE 300 WOODBURY, MN 55125			MADAMBA, GLENFORD J	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2151				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ssiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,276	SHAFTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenford Madamba	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/2004, 11/2007.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-10, 15-23, and 27-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Viswanath, U.S. Patent Publication US 2004/0019670 A1.

As per Claims 1, 15, and 28, Viswanath discloses a method comprising:

applying changes (e.g., Change Request) [0028] to candidate configuration data of a network device (e.g., Configuration Context 206a-c) [Figs. 11 7 47] (e.g., Test Case File(s) 400/406) [Fig. 11];

applying an implementation-specific configuration policy to validate the changed candidate configuration data (e.g., Verify & Validate Changes to Configuration Information) [Abstract]; and

selectively committing (e.g., Auto Commit) [0079] the changed candidate configuration data to operational configuration data (Persistent Store 204) [Fig. 2] based on a result of the validation (e.g., ‘Has data Changed?’ _302; ‘Yes’ or ‘No’) [Fig. 7].

Claims 15 and 28 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 2, 16 and 29, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy comprises:

identifying an error within the changed candidate configuration data based on the implementation-specific configuration policy (e.g., ‘Warning of Error?’ 436 → ‘Error’) [Fig. 12]; and

correcting the error by automatically altering the changed candidate configuration data in response to the identified error (e.g., ‘Handle the Error’ 438) [Fig. 12].

Claims 16 and 29 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 3, 17 and 30, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy comprises:

identifying a warning condition within the changed candidate configuration data based on the implementation-specific configuration policy (e.g., ‘Warning of Error?’ 436 → ‘Warning’) [Fig. 12]; and

correcting the warning condition by automatically altering the changed candidate configuration data (e.g., ‘Make the Change’ 442) [Fig. 12].

Claims 17 and 30 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 4, 18 and 31, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy comprises:

receiving a commit command (e.g., Auto Commit) [0079]; and
automatically applying the implementation-specific configuration policy in response to receiving the commit command (e.g., ‘Change Valid?’ 434) [Fig. 12].

Claims 18 and 31 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 5, 19 and 32, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein selectively committing the changes includes committing the changes to the operational configuration when application of the implementation-specific configuration policy

results in generation of a warning. (e.g., 'Notify Configuration API with Warning → 'Configuration API makes the change' 470) [Fig. 13].

Claims 19 and 32 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 6, 20 and 33, Viswanath discloses the method claim 1, wherein selectively committing the changes includes automatically rejecting the changes when application of the implementation-specific configuration policy results in an error (e.g, "If change is not 'valid' then the change is not made") [Abstract] [0028-0029].

Claims 20 and 33 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 7, 21 and 34, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy comprises:

generating a copy of the candidate configuration data (e.g., Configuration Context 206a-c) [0026] [0077] [0080]; and

applying the implementation-specific configuration policy to the copy of the candidate configuration (e.g., Validate Change 458) / Change Valid? 460) [Fig. 13].

Claims 21 and 34 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 8, 22 and 35, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 7, wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy to the copy of the candidate configuration occurs via a Extensible Markup Language (XML) Application Program Interface (API) (e.g., Configuration API 222) [0024-0025] [Fig. 2] (e.g., XML documents) [0023] [0079].

Claims 22 and 35 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claims 9, 23, 36 and 37, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 7, wherein generating a copy of the candidate configuration data comprises generating a version of the candidate configuration data that conforms to an Extensible Markup Language (e.g., XML documents) [0023] [0079], and wherein applying an implementation-specific configuration policy comprises applying an Extensible Style Language Transformation (XSLT) script to the copy of the candidate configuration data (e.g., XSLT) [0023-0025].

Claims 23, 36 and 37 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claim 10, Viswanath discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the implementation-specific configuration policy comprises an Extensible Style Language Transformation (XSLT) script (e.g, XSLT) [0023-0025].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11-14, 24-26, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Watson-Luke et al (hereinafter Watson-Luke), U.S. Patent Publication US 2005/0114692 A1.

As per Claim 11, 24 and 38, Viswanath in view of Watson-Luke discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the implementation-specific configuration policy is

user-definable (Augmenting of existing Validation Classes / Registering of New Validation Classes by Customer/User) [0017-0121] by a client (Client 10) [Fig. 1A], the method further comprising:

receiving input from the client (Configuration Context 'Input') [0026]; and
updating the implementation-specific configuration policy based on the input (Augmenting of existing Validation Classes / Registering of New Validation Classes by Customer/User) [0017-0121].

With regards to the claim, while Viswanath discloses substantial features of the invention, the additionally recited feature of the method wherein the implementation-specific configuration policy is user-definable by a client, the method further comprising receiving input from the client and updating the implementation-specific configuration policy based on the input is taught by Watson-Luke in a related endeavor.

Watson-Luke discloses as his invention a LifeCycle Management Suite (LMS), which includes a data-store, server, file-based data, and configuration tools components. In order to manage the 'configuration' effectively, version control tools may be provided. These are applied to file-based data / representation of the configuration. These include basic tools for committing changes to configuration, viewing differences between configuration, and grouping configuration items, for version control purposes [Abstract]. Specifically, Watson-Luke discloses the additionally recited feature of the method, wherein the implementation-specific configuration policy is user-

definable (Augmenting of existing Validation Classes / Registering of New Validation Classes by Customer/User) [0017-0121] by a client (Client 10) [Fig. 1A], the method further comprising receiving input from the client (Configuration Context ‘Input’) [0026]; and updating the implementation-specific configuration policy based on the input (Augmenting of existing Validation Classes / Registering of New Validation Classes by Customer/User) [0017-0121].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify Viswanath’s invention, with the above said feature, as disclosed by Watson-Luke, for the motivation of providing APIs that have the ability to create, update and delete configuration items in systems [Abstract].

Claims 24 and 38 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claim 12, 25 and 39, Viswanath in view of Watson-Luke discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving the changes from a client associated with an authorization level; and selecting the implementation-specific configuration policy from a plurality of implementation-specific configuration policies based on the determined authorization level.

With regards to the claim, while Viswanath discloses substantial features of the invention, the additionally recited feature of the method further comprising receiving the changes from a client associated with an authorization level; and selecting the implementation-specific configuration policy from a plurality of implementation-specific configuration policies based on the determined authorization level is taught by Watson-Luke in a related endeavor.

Watson-Luke discloses as his invention a LifeCycle Management Suite (LMS), which includes a data-store, server, file-based data, and configuration tools components. In order to manage the 'configuration' effectively, version control tools may be provided. These are applied to file-based data / representation of the configuration. These include basic tools for committing changes to configuration, viewing differences between configuration, and grouping configuration items, for version control purposes [Abstract]. Specifically, Watson-Luke discloses the additionally recited feature of the method further comprising receiving the changes from a client associated with an authorization level (e.g., Privileges / Access Level) [0208]; and selecting the implementation-specific configuration policy from a plurality of implementation-specific configuration policies based on the determined authorization level (e.g. Existing set of Validation Classes / newly registered Validation Class(es)) [0121]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify Viswanath's invention, with the above said feature, as disclosed by Watson-Luke, for the motivation of providing APIs that have the ability to create, update and delete configuration items in systems [Abstract].

Claims 25 and 39 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claim 13, 26 and 40, Viswanath in view of Watson-Luke discloses the method of claim 12, further comprising:

receiving identification information from the client (e.g., Login Username / Password) [0017-0121]; and

determining the authorization level based on the identification information (e.g., JAVA Authentication and Authorization Service {JAAS}) [0197-0211] (e.g., Privileges / Access Level) [0208].

With regards to the claim, while Viswanath discloses substantial features of the invention, the additionally recited feature of the method further comprising receiving identification information from the client, and determining the authorization level based on the identification information is taught by Watson-Luke in a related endeavor.

Watson-Luke discloses as his invention a LifeCycle Management Suite (LMS), which includes a data-store, server, file-based data, and configuration tools components. In order to manage the ‘configuration’ effectively, version control tools may be provided. These are applied to file-based data / representation of the configuration. These include basic tools for committing changes to configuration, viewing differences between configuration, and grouping configuration items, for version

control purposes [Abstract]. Specifically, Watson-Luke discloses the additionally recited feature of the method of claim 12, further comprising receiving identification information from the client (e.g., Login Username / Password) [0017-0121]; and determining the authorization level based on the identification information (e.g., JAVA Authentication and Authorization Service {JAAS}) [0197-0211] (e.g., Privileges / Access Level) [0208].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify Viswanath's invention, with the above said feature, as disclosed by Watson-Luke, for the motivation of providing APIs that have the ability to create, update and delete configuration items in systems [Abstract].

Claims 26 and 40 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by their statutory category, and thus rejected accordingly.

As per Claim 14, Viswanath in view of Watson-Luke discloses the method of claim 13, wherein identification information includes a password and a username (e.g., Login Username / Password) [0017-0121].

With regards to the claim, while Viswanath discloses substantial features of the invention, the additionally recited feature of the method of claim 13, wherein identification information includes a password and a username is taught by Watson-Luke in a related endeavor.

Watson-Luke discloses as his invention a LifeCycle Management Suite (LMS), which includes a data-store, server, file-based data, and configuration tools components. In order to manage the 'configuration' effectively, version control tools may be provided. These are applied to file-based data / representation of the configuration. These include basic tools for committing changes to configuration, viewing differences between configuration, and grouping configuration items, for version control purposes [Abstract]. Specifically, Watson-Luke discloses the additionally recited feature of the method wherein identification information includes a password and a username (e.g., Login Username / Password) [0017-0121].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify Viswanath's invention, with the above said feature, as disclosed by Watson-Luke, for the motivation of providing APIs that have the ability to create, update and delete configuration items in systems [Abstract].

Conclusion

1. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the

references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Thiagarajan Patent No.: US 7,032,014
- Sciacca Patent No.: US 6,760,761

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace Martin can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151